

Applicants respectfully submit that Groups V, VI, and XI are closely related in nature. Although Group VI claims are directed to a vector library and cells, Group VI and Group V share common technical features of a vector as recited in Group V. In addition, Group XI, which contains only one claim, essentially exemplifies the vector recited in Group V. Accordingly, a search covering the subject matter of Group V claims necessarily would cover the subject matter of Group VI and XI claims. Thus, Applicants submit that the inventions of Groups V, VI, and XI can be efficiently searched and examined together without placing a significant additional burden on the examiner, and that the relevant art for all three groups can be found in the same or related classes.

Further, Applicants respectfully point out that claim 48 of Group V is a linking claim for claims of Groups I, VI, and XI. Pursuant to MPEP 809.04, “[i]f a linking claim is allowed, the examiner must thereafter examine species if the linking claim is generic thereto, or he or she must examine the claims to the non-elected inventions that are linked to the elected invention by such allowed linking claim.”

Based on these reasons, Applicants submit that Groups V, VI, and XI (at least Groups V and XI) can be searched simultaneously without imposing a substantial additional burden on the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

In response to the species restriction requirement, Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, and for search purposes only, the following species: 1) M13 (one species from the phage group in claim 53); and 2) coat protein III (one species from the coat protein group in claim 54). Applicants submit that the species subjected to election are encompassed by Markush groups. Pursuant to MPEP 803.02, “[I]f the members of the Markush group are sufficiently few in number or so closely related that a search and examination of the entire claim can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine all claims on the merits, even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions.” In addition, Applicants respectfully point out that the search of the Markush-type claim will be extended to non-elected species should no prior art be found that anticipates or renders obvious the elected species (MPEP 803.02). Further,

as requested by the Examiner, Applicants hereby list claims 1-66 and 79 as being readable on the elected species.

The Examiner may address any questions raised by this submission to the undersigned at 617-951-7000. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition for same and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to **Deposit Account No. 18-1945**.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: March 11, 2003

Customer No: 28120
Docketing Specialist
Ropes & Gray
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: 617-951-7000
Fax: 617-951-7050



David P. Halstead
Reg. No. 44,735